

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/891,014	06/25/2001	Michael D. Crandall	54185USA8B.014	9951
32692	. 06/09/2003			
3M INNOVATIVE PROPERTIES COMPANY			EXAMINER	
PO.BOX 33427 ST. PAUL, MN 55133-3427			ZIRKER, DANIEL R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1771	ſ i
			DATE MAILED: 06/09/2003	l (

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

A-9-1

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Group Art Unit
-The MAILING DATE of this communication appears	s on the cover sheet	beneath th correspondence address -
P riod for Reply		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET T OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	0 EXPIRE3 -	MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE
 Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a r If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by defau Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by sta Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the matern adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 	eply within the statutory n tt, expire SIX (6) MONTHS tute, cause the applicatio	ninimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. from the mailing date of this communication. In to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status Responsive to communication(s) filed on5/2/	03	
☐ This action is FINAL.		
☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 193		
Disposition of Claims		
12 Claim(s) 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 16	·35	is/are pending in the application.
Of the above claim(s) 33 - 35	is/are allowed.	
12/-32	is/are rejected.	
□ Claim(s)		is/are objected to.
· · ·		are subject to restriction or election
☐ Claim(s)		
□ Claim(s)pplication Papers		requirement
□ Claim(s) pplication Papers □ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	is 🗆 approved	requirement d
☐ Claim(s) pplication Papers ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on is/are object	is 🗆 approved	requirement d
□ Claim(s) pplication Papers □ The proposed drawing correction, filed on is/are objection □ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.	is 🗆 approved	requirement d
☐ Claim(s)	is 🗆 approved	requirement d
☐ Claim(s)	is 🗆 approved	requirement d
□ Claim(s)	is □ approved	requirement d □ disapproved. er
□ Claim(s) pplication Papers □ The proposed drawing correction, filed on is/are objected. The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected. The specification is objected to by the Examiner. □ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Pri rity under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)–(d) □ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority is All □ Some* □ None of the:	is approved approved approved to by the Examine approved to by the Examine approved to be approved approved to be approved to	requirement d □ disapproved. er
□ Claim(s)	is approved approved approved the description is approved approved the Examine approved approved in the control of the control	requirement d
□ Claim(s)	is approved approved approved to by the Examine ander 35 U.S.C. § 119 received.	requirement d □ disapproved. er (a)-(d).
□ Claim(s)	is approved approved approved to by the Examine and approved and approved a	requirement d
pplication Papers ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	is approved approved a proved approved approved approved approved approved application application approved app	requirement d
□ Claim(s)	is approved approved a proved approved approved approved approved approved application application approved app	requirement d
□ Claim(s)	is approved a proved	requirement d
□ Claim(s)	is approved approved a proved a proved approved approved application as have been received a Bureau (PCT Rule 17 pc).	requirement d
□ Claim(s)	is approved approved a proved a proved approved approved approved application as have been received all Bureau (PCT Rule 17 pc).	requirement d

Serial No. 09/891,014

Art Unit 1771

- 1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 2. Claims 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. More particularly, in independent claim 32 applicants appear to essentially repeat themselves at lines 13-16 of the claim from what previously was set forth at lines 5-9 regarding what elements comprise the reaction product of the particular microspheres and what elements may exist in an independent state. Clarification is requested.
- 3. The specification is objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to make and use the invention. Hore particularly, as was mentioned in the interview (Paper No. 8), the Examiner has been unable to find any sort of enabling description with respect to the term "solid" microsphere and consequently fails to understand just what this term means, even though it has been used before in the patent literature. For example, does "solid" mean "free of porosity", or the like? Clarification is requested.

Serial No. 09/891,014

Art Unit 1771

- 4. Claims 22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as being based upon a non-enabling description.
- 5. Claims 21-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cooprider et al. -617 taken individually for claims 21, 22, and 25-32, or in view of Le Fevre for claims 23 and 24, substantially for the reasons set forth in paragraph No. 3 of Paper No. 7, together with the following additional observations. Initially it is noted that applicants admit that independent claim 21 corresponds to previous claim 7, and the only other independent claim, claim 30 corresponds to previous claim 11, each of these former claims having been cancelled. Applicants have vigorously arqued (Response, pages 8-9) that Cooprider et al. fails to teach a microsphere adhesive composition that includes a chain transfer agent, and also that to utilize a chain transfer agent lacks "requisite suggestion or motivation for modifying the microsphere adhesive". The Examiner initially notes (as applicants do not apparently contest) that Japanese Patent Abstract -136 and the Concise Encyclopedia of Polymer Science and Engineering are not contested for the fact that chain transfer agents are well known in the polymer ant such as the pressure sensitive acrylic adhesive art particularly focused on by JP -136. Additionally, the Examiner respectfully submits that it is well known in the polymer adhesive art that chain transfer agents by regulating the length of the polymer

Serial No. 09/891,014

Art Unit 1771

chains of the particular composition control the amount of adhesiveness the resulting polymer composition exhibits. More particularly, if the adhesive chains are made shorter for the utilization of a greater amount of chain transfer agents, the adhesiveness of the composition will increase, and vice versa. Accordingly, the Examiner must respectfully submit that the utilization of such chain transfer agents in adhesive compositions to regulate the adhesion of the resulting composition is extremely well known in the art. With respect to the dependent claims, the performance parameter of claim 25 is believed to be, if not inherently present, at most an obvious optimization to one of ordinary skill depending upon the particular adhesive strength desired and what other parameters that are seen to exist are each believed to be, if not expressly or inherently disclosed, obvious modifications to one of ordinary skill, in the absence of unexpected results.

- 6. Claims 33-35, each of which require the separate presence of polyacrylamide in the adhesive composition are allowed.
- 7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Note also the parent application, U.S. 6,296,932B1 to Crandall et al.
- 8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel

Serial No. 09/891,014

Art Unit 1771

Zirker whose telephone number is (703) 308-0031. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30 A.M. to 6:00 P.M. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel Morris, can be reached on (703) 308-2414. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9310.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308±0661.

Dzirker:cdc

June 3, 2003

DANIEL ZIRKER PRIMARY EXAMINER GROUP 1300

Daniel Zirken